

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

### In the Claims:

Claims 10 – 17 and 23-40 remain in this application. Claims 1-9 have been canceled. Claims 18 – 22 have been withdrawn. New claims 23-40 have been added.

### Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102(a):

Claims 10 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Micro Lithography, Inc. (<http://www.mliusa.com/products.htm#top>) (hereinafter “MLI”).

MLI fails to disclose, “**fusing** a pellicle to a frame,” (emphasis added) as recited in claim 10. MLI mentions use of a, “laser melt process to mount the film onto the pellicle frame.” Such information does not disclose **fusing** a pellicle to a frame, as recited in claim 10. Such a “laser melt process” could very well refer to “melt bonding,” which involves melting an adhesive which then forms a bond after it cools and resolidifies. Without further information (not provided by MLI), it is impossible to determine what is involved in the “laser melt process” and whether it involves melt bonding, fusing, or some other process.

MLI also fails to disclose, “attaching the frame to a reticle,” as recited in claim 10. MLI makes absolutely no mention of a reticle, much less that it is fused to a frame. Applicant requests that the Examiner either cite where in MLI such an attachment of a reticle is disclosed or withdraw the rejection.

The Examiner also asserts that MLI discloses that the reticle is attached to the frame without using adhesive. Nowhere does MLI mention a reticle, much less whether or not adhesive is used to attach a reticle to a frame. Applicant requests that the Examiner either cite where in MLI such a disclosure is made or withdraw the rejection.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

Claims 11-14, 16, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MLI.

All of claims 11-14, 16, and 17 depend from claim 10. As discussed above, MLI fails to disclose all limitations of claim 10 since MLI fails to disclose fusing a pellicle to a frame. Thus, MLI also fails to disclose all limitations of claims 11-14, 16, and 17.

Further, the Examiner asserts that MLI teaches fusing of the pellicle to a frame, "in order to keep the pellicle and frame clean." Nowhere does MLI disclose that fusing a pellicle to a frame keeps the pellicle and frame clean. Applicant requests that the Examiner either cite where in MLI such a disclosure is made or withdraw the rejection.

**Conclusion:**

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 10 – 17 and 23-40 are patentable, and accordingly, the application is now in condition for allowance. Early issuance of the Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge shortages or credit overpayments to Deposit Account No. 500393. A Fee Transmittal is enclosed in duplicate for fee processing purposes. The Examiner is invited to call Michael Plimier at (408) 765-7857 if there remains any issue with allowance of this case.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Dated: 6/30, 2004



Michael A. Bernaditou  
Reg. No. 35,934

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026  
(408) 765-8648